

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please cancel Claims 11-13 without prejudice.

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 11, 2002. Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Unelected Claims 11-13 have been cancelled without prejudice above. The acknowledgement given in the Office Action that Claims 6 and 7 include allowable subject matter is gratefully accepted.

Before turning to the rejections in the Office Action, it is noted in response to paragraph 12 of the Office Action that formal drawings have previously been submitted and accepted by the Draftperson.

Turning to the Office Action, independent Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 were rejected in paragraph 4 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,526,403 to Tam. However, Tam relates to a wireline interface that permits a cellular telephone to place and receive calls using both cellular and wireline services. Nothing in Tam refers to a composite cellular terminal providing one or more service options. In particular, decision block 217 of Fig. 7A of Tam only determines if the incoming call is a cellular call and thus provides no teaching of "recognizing a service option from a received paging message", as recited in Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 15 of Tam cited in the Office Action also does not teach "retrieving an incoming call alert tone corresponding to the recognized service option; and generating the retrieved

incoming call alert tone" as also recited in Claim 1.

Independent Claims 3, 5, 9 and 10 have identical or like recitations as those discussed above for Claim 1 and may be distinguished in at least like manner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 9 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,962,524 to Murata et al. in paragraph 5 of the Office Action. However, Murata relates to transfer of a call from one cellular phone to another. Nothing is cited in Murata relating to a composite cellular terminal providing one or more service options. In particular, Figs. 4B and 5B of Murata only show "incoming call signals" in the context of call transfer. Thus, Murata fails to teach "recognizing a service option from a received paging message", as recited in Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 8 of Murata cited by the Examiner also does not teach "retrieving an incoming call alert tone corresponding to the recognized service option; and generating the retrieved incoming call alert tone" as also recited in Claim 1.

Independent Claim 9 has identical or like recitations as those discussed above for Claim 1 and may be distinguished in at least like manner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 9.

Independent Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,058,151 to Tanaka et al. in paragraph 6 of the Office Action. However, Tanaka relates to routing of calls between a base station connected to a wired circuit and a radio telephone that

interfaces with the base station. There is nothing in Tanaka relating to a composite cellular terminal providing one or more service options. In particular, nothing in Fig. 2 of Tanaka or elsewhere relates to "recognizing a service option from a received paging message", as recited in Claim 1. Fig. 2 focuses exclusively on call reception and signals. Consequently, Claim 2 of Tanaka cited in the Office Action also does not teach "retrieving an incoming call alert tone corresponding to the recognized service option; and generating the retrieved incoming call alert tone" as also recited in Claim 1.

Independent Claims 3, 5, 9 and 10 have identical or like recitations as those discussed above for Claim 1 and may be distinguished in at least like manner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,303,284 to Shinozaki in paragraph 7 of the Office Action. However, Shinozaki relates to producing different ringing tones as a function of the use mode (portable or cellular) of a portable telephone set. Again, nothing in Shinozaki refers to a composite cellular terminal providing one or more service options. In particular, nothing in the description relating to decision block S16 of Fig. 2 of Shinozaki refers to "recognizing a service option from a received paging message", as recited in Claim 1. Consequently, the "Summary" section of Shinozaki cited in the Office Action also fails to teach "retrieving an incoming call alert tone corresponding to the recognized service option; and generating the retrieved incoming call alert tone" as also recited in

Claim 1.

Independent Claim 9 has identical or like recitations as those discussed above for Claim 1 and may be distinguished in at least like manner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,452,354 to Kyronlahti et al. in paragraph 8 of the Office Action. However, Kyronlahti simply relates to different cellular phones having different ring tones, based on the phone number or other subscriber information. (See col. 2, lines 8-9 and col. 3, lines 26-30 of Kyronlahti) As such, there is only one ring tone per phone. There is nothing of pertinence in Kyrolahti relating to a composite cellular terminal providing one or more service options. In particular, Fig. 3 of Kyronlahti cited in the Office Action provides no teaching of "recognizing a service option from a received paging message", as recited in Claim 1. In addition, the "Summary" of Kyronlahti cited in the Office Action as noted only refers to different cellular phones having different rings from each other, and also does not teach "retrieving an incoming call alert tone corresponding to the recognized service option; and generating the retrieved incoming call alert tone" as also recited in Claim 1.

Independent Claim 9 has identical or like recitations as those discussed above for Claim 1 and may be distinguished in at least like manner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

Finally, independent Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10, along with dependent Claims 2, 4 and 8, were rejected in paragraph 11 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,157,836 to Cashman in view of Murata or Tanaka or Shinozaki or Kyronlahti or Tam. Cashman does relate to a composite cellular terminal providing one or more service options and selection based on distinguishing the paging signals. However, as noted in the prior Amendment, Cashman fails to disclose a unique alert tone for each service option. The Examiner maintains that Murata or Tanaka or Shinozaki or Kyronlahti or Tam teach the generation of unique call alert tones for one or more service options.

It is respectfully submitted that Murata or Tanaka or Shinozaki or Kyronlahti or Tam does not include such teachings. As discussed above, the different tone alerts in each of those patents relate only to call service. Thus, even if these patents are each combined with Cashman, it would result in a composite cellular terminal providing one or more service options where the call service may have different tone alerts. There is no suggestion or teaching of applying the different tone alerts for call services to one or more service options in a composite cellular terminal.

Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 is respectfully requested. As to the rejections of dependent Claims 2, 4 and 8 noted above, without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 4 and 8, it is submitted that they are allowable by virtue of their dependencies on the independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of

dependent Claims 2, 4 and 8 is respectfully requested.

As noted, the allowability of Claims 6 and 7 is gratefully accepted.

However, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the application, namely Claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable consideration and allowance of Claims 1-10 is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner is respectfully requested to phone applicants' attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP

By:



Paul J. Farrell

Registration No. 33,494

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-8484
(516) 228-8516 (FAX)